

Cosmic Acceleration: A Natural Remedy For Horizon and Flatness Problems

Abhas Mitra

*Theoretical Physics Division, Bhabha Atomic Research Center,
Mumbai-400085, India
E-mail: amitra@apsara.barc.ernet.in*

The standard big bang cosmology has been greatly successful in explaining many observational aspects of the real universe. However, two particular difficulties faced by it are the so-called “horizon” and “flatness” problems. By assuming that the recently found cosmic acceleration to be a genuine and ever present effect, we show that, the resultant modified Friedman model is free from both the above referred problems, and there is no need to invoke the additional “inflationary” initial phase as a separate ingredient. The important cosmological milestones of the standard big bang cosmology (which predicts cosmic deceleration) like GUT symmetry breaking epoch or radiation matter decoupling epoch may remain more or less unchanged in the modified cosmology in terms of red-shift values. However, in terms of cosmic time t , all such epochs occur earlier as the universe becomes older in this case.

I. INTRODUCTION

Only a few years ago, it was believed that the universe is undergoing a decelerated expansion (DE). Then it was felt that there is no compelling reason to retain the “cosmological constant” term, Λ , in the Einstein equations describing the evolution of the universe. In such a case, it followed that, the behaviour of the universe filled with matter and radiation, could be broadly described as $S(t) = \alpha t^n$, where $n < 1$ and α is a constant of proportionality [1,2]. For instance, for the early radiation dominated era, one has $S \sim t^{1/2}$ and for the matter dominated universe, $S \sim t^{2/3}$ (for a closed universe with curvature parameter $k = 0$).

However, over the past few years, studies of luminosity-distance studies involving type supernova I, have suggested that the universe is undergoing accelerated expansion (AE). Such AE is possible either due to presence of a Λ term or because of the presence of a quintessence [3]. The simplest way to broadly represent the AE would be to write

$$S(t) = \alpha t^n; \quad n > 1 \quad (1)$$

In the past era of supposed decelerated expansion, one would encounter the so-called horizon and flatness puzzle. In the former case, it is difficult to find an answer as to why the universe is so isotropic and homogeneous if the universe comprised causally disconnected tiny patches in the very early era. In the latter case, one has to explain why the quantity $|\Omega - 1| \sim \mathcal{O}(1)$ in the present epoch unless Ω was extremely fine tuned to unity in the early past. Here Ω is the ratio of the actual density of the universe (ρ) to the critical density needed to close the universe $\rho_c = 8\pi G/3H^2$, where H is the Hubble constant. To remedy such problems, in the framework of the supposed (incorrect) decelerated expansion, one needed to introduce, in a fairly *ad hoc* manner, a brief spell of sudden exponential expansion by a factor of $\sim 10^{30}$ starting from $t \approx 10^{-35}$ s. It is this rapid expansion which is supposed to bring distant regions within the sphere of causality and simultaneously flattening the universe [2–5]. Following this brief inflationary period, the universe is supposed to revert back to the original decelerated expansion mode in a manner which is hardly well understood.

However, we shall show below that once we accept the fact the universe is undergoing AE rather than DE and

assume that it was so in the past too, there is no need to postulate an *ad hoc* inflationary phase atleast for the purpose of solving the horizon or flatness problems.

II. REMOVAL OF HORIZON PROBLEM

The range of the causal horizon is defined as

$$d_H = S(t) \int_0^t \frac{dt'}{S(t')} \quad (2)$$

Using Eq. (1) we see that

$$d_H = \frac{S(t)}{k} \int_0^t t'^{-n} dt' = \frac{S(t)}{k} \frac{t'^{(1-n)}}{(1-n)} \Big|_0^t \quad (3)$$

For $n > 1$, the above integral blows up and there is no horizon problem.

III. FLATNESS PROBLEM

In the presence of the cosmological term, the relationship between present density u , Hubble constant H , and scale size S is [2]

$$H^2 + \frac{K}{S^2} = \frac{8\pi G u}{3} + \frac{\Lambda c^2}{3} \quad (4)$$

Dividing both sides by H^2 , we have

$$1 + \frac{K}{H^2 S^2} = \Omega + \frac{\Lambda c^2}{3 H^2} \quad (5)$$

Or,

$$\Omega - 1 = \frac{k}{H^2 S^2} - \frac{\Lambda c^2}{3 H^2} \quad (6)$$

Here note that

$$\dot{S} = n \alpha t^\beta; \quad \beta = n - 1 > 0; \quad H = \frac{\dot{S}}{S} = n/t \quad (7)$$

Using the foregoing relationships, we find from Eq. (6) that for the present epoch $t = t_1$ and for the past epoch $t = t_2$

$$\frac{\Omega_1 - 1}{\Omega_2 - 1} = \frac{k \alpha^{-2} t_1^{-2\beta} - \frac{\Lambda_1 t_1^2 c^2}{3}}{k \alpha^{-2} t_2^{-2\beta} - \frac{\Lambda_2 t_2^2 c^2}{3}} \quad (8)$$

As $t_2 \rightarrow 0$, the second term in the denominator of the above equation $\rightarrow 0$, and we obtain

$$\frac{\Omega_1 - 1}{\Omega_2 - 1} = \left(\frac{t_1}{t_2} \right)^{-2\beta} - \left(\frac{\Lambda_1}{\Lambda_2} \right) t_1^2 t_2^{2\beta} \quad (9)$$

Again as $t_2 \rightarrow 0$, both the terms on the RHS of the foregoing equation $\rightarrow 0$ if Λ varies less sharply than t^{-2} . Therefore, we find that

$$\Omega_1 - 1 = \mathcal{O}(0)(\Omega_2 - 1) \quad (10)$$

So in the present universe, we should not only have $|\Omega_1 - 1| \sim \mathcal{O}(1)$, but, we should actually have $\Omega_1 = \Omega_{matter} + \Omega_\Lambda \rightarrow 1$. Then there is no flatness problem, and on the other hand, the universe should be completely flat at any appreciable value of t . In fact very recent observations indeed show that this is precisely the case [6].

IV. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

The age of the universe in the present case could be finite. This can be seen in the following simple way:

$$t = \int \frac{dS}{\dot{S}} \quad (11)$$

By using Eq. (7), we see that

$$t = \frac{S^{1/n}}{\alpha} \quad (12)$$

In contrast there could be more involved models incorporating AE for which one may have $t = \infty$ for $S \neq 0$. In other words there could be singularity free models for which horizon and flatness problems naturally do not arise [7]. However, we found that in a more orthodox model of AE with a finite age of the universe, horizon and flatness problems cease to exist and, thus, there is no need to postulate, in an *ad hoc* manner the occurrence of a brief spell of inflation. It can be shown that even if the horizon and flatness problems disappear with the idea of inflation in the present epoch, in principle, they may reappear, in future if $k \neq 0$ and the universe were undergoing DE [8,9]. On the other hand, such problems do not recur for the present simple model incorporating AE. And although, the singularity and a hot early epoch lie in a finite past, in the present simple case of an orthodox model, note that the universe begins with a “whimper” ($\dot{S} = 0$ infinity) rather than a “bang” ($\dot{S} = \infty$).

We have of course, not suggested any physics which may be driving the universe in the AE mode. This is a completely different problem in its own right and many authors are addressing to it. We would simply mention here that it is possible to have practically any form of a time varying Λ and consequent desired evolution [10]. And if we consider the AE occurring due to a Λ term, which is intrinsic to the fabric of spacetime, the presence of such a term may not significantly alter the local thermodynamics. Thus the relationship between S or z and temperature could be unaltered in such a scheme. In other words, as an example, the epoch of decoupling may still be at $z \approx 1100$ as in the standard Λ -free cosmology. However the $S(t)$ or z and t will change. Consequently the epoch of decoupling will lie at different model dependent cosmic time.

-
- [1] S. Weinberg, “Gravitation and Cosmology” (Wiley, New York, 1972)
 - [2] C.W. Misner, K. S. Thorne, and J. Wheeler, “Gravitation”, (Freeman, San Fransisco, 1973)
 - [3] N.A. Bachall, J.P. Ostriker, S. Perlmutter and P.J. Steinhardt, *Science*, **284**, 1481 (1999) and ref. therein
 - [4] A.H. Guth, *Phys. Rev. D* **23**, 347 (1981)
 - [5] A.D. Linde, *Phys. Lett. B* **108**, 389 (1982)
 - [6] P. de. Bernardis et al., *Nature*, **404**, 955 (2000)
 - [7] R. Fakir, *Astrophys. J.* **537**, 533 (2000)
 - [8] J.R.F. Ellis, *Class. Q. Grav.*, **5**, 891 (1988)
 - [9] J.V. Narlikar and T. Padmanabhan, *Ann. Rev. Astron. Astrophys.* **29**, 325 (1991)
 - [10] J.M. Overduin and F.I. Cooperstock, *Phys. Rev. D* **58**, 043506 (1998)